

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENTED STATES DEPAREMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark, Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS Address, Company, 22313-1456 www.upuglo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/046,141	01/16/2002	Tetsuo Yamaguchi	2870-0177P	3642	
2292	7590 12/02/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			CHEA, THORL		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1752		

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/046,141	YAMAGUCHI, TETSUO				
	Examiner	Art Unit	1			
	Thorl Chea	1752				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli	ication. A proper re	ply to a			
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathase been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions.	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. asion and the corresponding amount of the asion and the corresponding amount of the asion.	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriate expressions.	See MPEP			
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo- earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	d statutory period for reply originally set in onths after the mailing date of the final rej	i the final Office action; or jection, even if timely filed,	(2) as set forth in , may reduce any			
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>04 November 2003</u> CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 	. Appellant's Brief must be filed R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	d within the period s of the appeal.	et forth in			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se	r reconsideration has been consecutions	sidered but does NC	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered ber raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which we	re newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	t(s) a) will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided belo	i)⊠ will be entered ow or appended.	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: none.						
Claim(s) objected to: none.	Claim(s) objected to: none.					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-14.	Claim(s) rejected: 1-14.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	-			
9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. ☐ Other:	*	Thorl Chea				
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1752				

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 10/846;141

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reson set forth in the previous office action and the applicants fails to provide a convincing argument with respect to the issue related to the issue the Examiner made with respect t results presented in the specification disclosure. Note to the response to the applicants argument. Also, see the results in Ito et al ('084) in column 97-98 Table 23 wherein the results is comparable to that of Table 13 of the specification disclosure. In response to Applicant's argument that the applicant has a different reason for, or advantage resulting from doing what the prior art relied upon has suggested, it is noted that it is well settled that this is not demonstrative of non-obviousness, In Re Kronig 190 USPQ 425, 428 (CCPA 1976); In Re Lintner 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972); the prior art motivation or advantage may be different than that of applicant while still supporting a conclusion of obviousness. In Re Wiseman 201 USPQ 658 (CCPA 1979); Ex Parte Obiaya 227 USPQ 58 (Bd. of App 1985).